6-1959

Cooperative Extension and the Future

Warren Rovetch
Educational Research Associates

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION AND THE FUTURE

A Partial Examination of . . .
I. A Century of Change and Challenges to America
II. Agricultural Adjustment
III. Extension and the Future.

PREPARED THROUGH THE COOPERATION OF

THE FARM FOUNDATION, CHICAGO, ILL.
CENTER FOR AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT
IOWA STATE COLLEGE, AMES, IOWA

An experimental discussion
handbook prepared for extracurricular
use by Extension workers
attending 1959 Extension Summer Schools

CAA-3, JUNE 1959

52-4

FOREWORD

This handbook is the result of a joint effort by the Farm Foundation and its National Agricultural Policy Committee and the Center for Agricultural Adjustment at Iowa State College.

The Farm Foundation. The Farm Foundation was established in 1933 to improve "the economic, social, educational and cultural conditions of rural life." Toward this end the Farm Foundation has tried to identify new areas of need, and to use its resources to stimulate research on particularly pressing problems in these areas. The Foundation, through research and extension committees, tries to provide an environment conducive to promotion of research, evaluation of the results and translation of the findings into grass roots action.

Areas of concentration have included farm management, land tenure and water resources, rural sociology, rural health and rural education.

In 1948 agricultural policy was added as an area of primary concern. Since 1951 the Foundation has held an annual Agricultural Policy Training Conference. Since 1953 the Foundation has provided scholarships for county agents to attend the agricultural policy courses offered at the Extension summer schools. To direct work in this area a National Agricultural Policy Committee was established. The current committee chairman is Mervin G. Smith, Ohio State University.

At the 1958 Public Policy Conference, 76 Extension and research staff members from 46 states, the USDA, the embassies of Australia, India and Japan and other interested agencies examined the income problems of commercial agriculture. Much of the research and data developed in that conference and past conferences is reflected in this handbook.

The Center for Agricultural Adjustment. In 1956 a group of Iowa leaders asked Iowa State to assess its research and Extension activities in the light of an earlier serious decline in hog prices and the continuing dilemma posed by agricultural surpluses. In early 1957 the College of Agriculture responded with a 5-month series of agricultural adjustment seminars. The seminar findings and conclusions complemented thought and research at many other Land Grant institutions as well as the concerns revealed through the Farm Foundation annual agricultural policy conferences. These findings were that "adjustment to economic growth is the foremost problem which faces agriculture. It is one of the major problems of American society. The problem is both pressing and complex. An entirely different emphasis in research, education and government programs is needed." The Iowa legislature supported this through a special appropriation to the college for the creation of a research and program Center for Agricultural Adjustment.

In the fall of 1957 county agents discussed these agricultural adjustment issues with county leaders. Then in early 1958 the Iowa Extension Service involved an estimated 50,000 Iowans in 6 weeks of discussion of "Challenge to Iowa." Radio, TV, newspaper and public school cooperation involved many thousands more. This took the examination of adjustment needs into the positive context of the future Iowans want. The effort involved the adaptation to Iowa needs of self-administered educational techniques and materials used in other states. "Challenge to Iowa" involved both a new role for Iowa Extension and new patterns of education and administration.

In early 1959 Iowa Extension, with Center support, developed a series of 3-day conference-workshops for over 1,000 selected Iowa leaders. This took the analysis of Iowa adjustment issues yet another step closer to the "threshhold of action."

Because agricultural adjustment as a concern is not a separate, distinct facet of the Extension Service task and opportunity, it calls for Extension adjustment. It was in part with this in mind the Kellogg Foundation provided the Agricultural Adjustment Center with limited funds to pursue experimental efforts within Iowa and to work with other states sharing similar concerns and interests.

Joint Farm Foundation and Center Interests. It is clear that the agricultural policy problems examined over the years through Farm Foundation-sponsored activities comprise a significant element of economic, social and other issues faced by Extension in all states and the concerns of the Center for Agricultural Adjustment for thus agricultural policy presents a point of clear mutual interest for the Center and the Farm Foundation. The joint effort of the Center and the Farm Foundation to produce this handbook is one of the first steps of cooperative effort which brings the distinctive contribution of two parties to tangible expression in an area of mutual concern.

This experimental handbook is intended as a discussion piece. It does not represent the position of the Farm Foundation or the Center. It is an effort to identify some of the questions which need to be raised and to provide background for the discussion of these questions. It does not raise all the questions, or any of the answers. It does take the broad approach thought essential for analysis of specific questions. Policy to guide Extension on the county or state level is a matter for decision in each individual state.

Your reactions to the usefulness of this handbook can provide the Foundation, the Center and others with guidance for production of other materials. Please address any comments to the Center for Agricultural Adjustment, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

Cooperative Extension and the Future

Compiled and organized by

Warren Rovetch,
Educational Research Associates
Boulder, Colorado

Handbook Contents

This handbook is experimental.
Is is not designed to substitute or replace any
or your regular class work.
It is intended to provide information, stimulation
and questions for informal extracurricular discussion.

1. Using This Handbook

A. Logic: "Extension and the Future", as approached in this handbook, is divided into three areas of consideration.

Policy, it has been said, is the "science of the relative." Therefore, the first step of examining national issues is important to the second step, a look at agricultural adjustment. These two steps set the stage for a re-appraisal of Extension's task.

I. First: A Century of Changes, Challenges and Trends for America: An examination of national issues and Great Debates with a view to consequences at the county level.
II. Second: Agricultural Adjustment: An examination of agriculture's interests and opportunities within the broad perspective of national policy and its significance at the county level.
III. Third: Extension, and the Future: What do the broad issues facing the nation and the problems of agricultural adjustment define as a guide for Extension's future?

Each section contains a limited examination of the issue and discussion questions.

B. Approach: Who sets up a discussion for any of these questions?

You do!

This handbook is not a course of study. It does not pretend to offer a complete discussion or raise all the questions regarding any issue. It is intended to stimulate your interest, offer some useful background, facts and focus on key questions. You take it from there.

Here are a few ways:

1. A group: Get together four or five agents, preferably from different states, as an informal group. Discuss the questions that appeal to you when and where you choose. You can invite someone from your summer school faculty to meet with you. Or you might ask someone from the university summer school faculty to meet with you to examine special questions.
2. A panel: Set up a panel group of faculty and students. Let others know it is going on so they can sit in, ask questions, etc.
3. A seminar: If you and a few others want to pursue all, some, or one of the issues posed in this handbook in depth, you can set up and run an extracurricular seminar. Check with your summer school staff if you want help on this.

4. A bull session: You are going to get together for bull sessions and to talk shop anyway. Without making a formal course, you could kick around some of the handbook questions.
5. Yourself: It is still a valid means of education to read and think by yourself. It certainly takes less time to organize this method.

If you and others decide to do any of this, it can add up to a lot of educational activity.

Remember - If you want any help in setting anything up, just check with the summer session staff.

I. A Century of Change and Challenges for America. Change is part of America. Historians have named certain periods. Though flappers and bootleggers will likely remain characters in the history of the "roaring Twenties', this and any other period involves more than a single line of dominant activity. Periods or "ages" are the total complex of the way we work and what we produce and the values that guide education, culture and religion, the social, economic, political and other patterns add up to a way of doing things, of living, and believing. In short the total picture of a period is presented in the "national character".

Though all things go on changing it takes time and a great set of changes to move things to a complete new formulation. A small example is the invention of the automobile - the early "horseless carriage" copies the old carriage as closely as possible. It wasn't until all the parts, wheels, internal combustion engine and so on, were put together in a complete new form that the first automobile was really born. "Horseless carriages" were an intermediate and transitional experiment between the horsedrawn buggy and the automobile; with the automobile came a host of other changes in society - some as cause of and some as effect.

As another example, the Morrill Act didn't come into being simply because all men agreed on a more democratic education system. Many strands of interest were involved - Franklin and Washington's idea of a non-sectarian American Academy; the West's wish for federal land grants to support economic development; the absence of wide-spread free secondary education; the need for more vocationally trained men in law, medicine and other professions. Thus Lincoln gave expression to much more in the national interest than the creation of "democracy's college" in signing the Morrill Act.

Our present period is still going through definition. Perhaps one stage was from the end of World War II until Sputnik. The present one may be the struggle for a "strategic concept". The very complexities of national change

and the Soviet threat to survival suggest we need to know ourselves and what is in our interest better than ever before. That is if we choose to influence history rather than letting it, including Communism, tell us where we should "inevitably" go.

Most frequently this is called the space age - but that seems an inadequate and less than inclusive summary of the vast array of issues before us. We seem to be going through nothing short of a mass of internal revolutions of science and technology, of social realignment, of distribution of income, of rural-urban relationships, of metropolitan explosion, and even a redefinition of equality and leadership in a political democracy. We see many things happening and yet no complete pattern to explain or relate all of them.

Agriculture: The agricultural politics of the 20's are gone as is the solid farm bloc front of corn, cotton and tobacco. The proportionate influence of rural interests in Congress has diminished and the corollary has been the rise in Congress of those who believe the federal government is not obligated to guarantee farm income. The agrarian myth has fallen, perhaps as much from a shift from "farming" to "agri-business" as from the discovery that our nation's democracy could survive with an increasingly small proportion of agrarians. Many people have abandoned the idea that federal programs can lift the lower third of farms - subsistence and below - to a level of adequate returns. Many encourage people now to leave the land rather than stay. Farm employment is now 10 percent of the total for the U. S. By 1975 it may be 4 percent. Even of the 10 percent we know that less than half produce 80 percent of what goes to market. The technological explosion in agriculture keeps pushing to more surplus and the possibility of 10¢ hogs. Consolidated schools, new roads and the growth of cities make more farm families suburbanites; working the land within the distance of an early evening round trip to the city, the doctor or whatever.

Industry: In industry a post-war tripling of research and development expenditure, automation and electronics are creating an ever increasing proportion of non-production scientific and technical "white collar" workers. Today, America is the first industrial society in which the "blue collar" worker is a minority. Unskilled workers displaced by automation may find themselves unemployable because industry's principal demand is the trained talent. The high cost of research, the high cost of development, and complex industrial patterns have produced for industry something of the same pattern as for agriculture - larger and fewer units that employ or direct through contracts the bulk of the resource and produce the bulk of the goods. 38 percent of all those employed in the U.S. now work for organizations employing more than 500 people. Twenty years ago the figure was 28 percent.

Society: In 1900 six out of every ten Americans lived in rural America. Today the Census Bureau reports that nearly seven out of every ten live - not just in the cities - but in the 168 metropolitan centers of the U.S. This has exploded the sprawling metropolitan slums and the even more expansive suburbs. With all the resulting problems, "suburban sprawl" symbolizes and gives reality to a closing of the gap between the semi-skilled and skilled worker, the salesman, the professional and the junior executive. Now about 43 percent of all non-farm families have incomes between $5,000 and $10,000 after taxes. Some have called this a "homogenization" of society; others have said that ability to buy a house, car, clothes and other physical possessions has for most become so standard that as compensation for being "organization men" we have become "status seekers." Another view is that while our society is more homogenous, the individual's own opportunities to live in diverse fashions have been expanded - apparent uniformity to the spectator is new diversity to the machinist or the farmer. There are other strong currents and forces: industrialization and the issue of integration in the South; the growing political strength of the West; changing public attitudes towards organized labor and our concept of corporate responsibilities.

The Great Debates. But with all this we have one overriding concern - a "strategic concept" of security which, given the nature of the Soviet threat, insures survival, dignity and continued evolution of an American quality of life. The nature of conflict with the Soviet Union is a matter of military defense, economic offenses, propaganda battles and so on. Thus it has become an all-pervading factor in the conduct of American life. In turn the quality of American education, our rate of economic growth and our system of values are as much part of the "strategic concept" as the hydrogen bomb. It has been said that the global issue, combined with the immense range of internal American revolutions, was challenging America to a new concept and definition of national character and self-interest.

Traditionally any sectional or economic interest could slug it out in the arena of national politics, thinking of nothing but itself and letting Congressional compromise settle the issue. Foreign affairs somehow got taken care of and anyway, as in World War I and II, we could take 2 years to make up our minds. The decision on Korea was made in a matter of hours. Now according to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, "the line between domestic and foreign affairs is wholly erased." Self-interest is intimately connected with national self-interest, which in turn involves a "strategic concept" of security and relations with the rest of the world.

Though there is a common use of phrases such as "urgency," "survival," the need for "excellence" and so on, there is by no means complete agreement on what is in the national interest. There are in fact sharp disputes on many

questions, and these have produced a range of Great Debates. Though quieter than the Lincoln-Douglas debates, they are no less fundamental or significant for the future course of our nation. "The time to worry about this country is not when we are battling among ourselves, for it is then that our democracy functions best. The time to worry is when all is moderation."

EDUCATION

The Scope Report, in its examination of Extension's educational mission, suggests that educational priorities must be selected and the method of education designed to meet the educational challenge posed by these present and future educational priorities. Thus Extension joins in the nationwide re-examination of educational objectives and methods.

Extension's concern with education has another tangent.

A. Agricultural Adjustment and Education. A broad concept of agricultural adjustment encompasses the changes now evident in rural-farm America and those further developments thought necessary to increase the stability and welfare of this sector. There is common agreement on one element of the agricultural adjustment problem. This is that the continuing decline in farming opportunities makes education and guidance designed to assist rural youth in the adjustment to urban social and vocational patterns a matter of the first priority.

The social, vocational and educational directions of urban society must be comprehended along with alternative educational philosophies by those concerned with education as a factor in agricultural adjustment. One reason is to prepare rural youth for city life. The trends and changes summarized by the phrase agricultural adjustment are part of a stream of fundamental changes remaking the social and political structure in the country. Youth unable to seek a future in agriculture, because of the technological revolution in farming, must make their future in an urban industrial community undergoing fundamental changes equal to or greater than those re-shaping American agriculture. This very reason forces those concerned with the adequacy of rural education to examine the Great Debate which may determine the course of all education.

A Half-Cenutry of Change-Rural Education's Share. In a little more than a half-century the American high school has changed from a preparatory school to a universally accessible institution. Today, more than 40 million Americans are enrolled in 125,000 elementary schools, 30,000 secondary schools and almost 2,000 colleges and universities. By 1960, there will be nearer 46,000,000 in schools.

Over a period of 60 years, the proportion being educated increased twelvefold. Of those aged 14 to 17 years, the proportion enrolled in high school increased from 7 percent in 1890 to 84 percent in 1950. More important the proportion of the 14 to 17 age group that graduated increased from 4 percent in 1900 to 60 percent in 1950. Education per student has also increased dramatically. In 1900, there were 37 enrolled students for every teacher in the nation's

elementary and high schools. Today, there are 26 for every teacher. The average school term has lengthened from 144 to 178 days. In 1900 only two-third of all enrolled students were actually in school on an average day. In recent years almost 90 percent of students have been present. All told, since 1900 actual teaching time per student has gone up about 170 percent.

Rural education has not shared fully in this growth and change. Small school districts, low density and lower income have produced a quality of rural education which - by all available measures including holding power and access to higher education - is less adequate than education provided in urban systems.

Appetite for Talent. As part of the broad shift in the composition, values and aims of society there is a changing attitude toward education. This has been called "a revolution in society's attitude toward men and women of high ability and advanced training in which ... we are just beginning to understand that one of the distinguishing marks of a modern complex society is its insatiable appetite for educated talent ..."

Recent sharp increases in employment of non-production workers demonstrate that the United States is the first industrial country in which the working class is no longer the majority of the work force. The key to this has been the increase in employment of professionals and technicians and their supporting staffs at a rate two-and-a-half times as fast as the labor force as a whole since World War II. In the 10 years, 1947 to 1957, the number of professional, technical and other non-production workers in manufacturing increased by 60 percent from 2,400,000 to 3,900,000, thus constituting one-fourth of the manufacturing labor force. During the same period the number of blue-collar workers remained almost stationary at a little under 13,000,000. Semi-skilled employment, though still the largest single occupational category, will increase at a rate much less than that of the labor force as a whole in the next decade.

B. The Debate. It would be a mistake to imagine that school consolidation and bigger schools, higher salaries and broader curriculum alone will provide adequate education in rural or urban schools. What then is the debate about? What are the issues?

Paul Woodring, consultant to the Fund for Advancement of Education, has looked at the issues in this way in his book, A Fourth of a Nation: Woodring says:

> The Dilemma: Just as war is too important to be left to the generals, education is too important to be left to the educators. Knowing this, the men who founded the American public school system did not delegate to schoolmasters the full responsibility for determining what the school should accomplish. As

originally established, the public schools reflected the views of men such as Jefferson and Franklin and of the people as a whole. But as the years passed and education became a profession, the people were increasingly content to leave its problems to professionals.

During the 19th century universal elementary education became a reality, and we were sure that was good. We assumed that eight years was better than four and at the end of the century we began to believe that twelve must be better than eight; but we never really thought through the problems of just what we wanted the schools to accomplish. Now nearly all states require attendance up to the age of 16 or 18. No other nation has ever attempted to provide an education for so many for so long. Unfortunately we established laws governing the length of education without first deciding what we expected of secondary education, without adequate consideration of the problems of individual differences in learning capacity, without a clear understanding of the important difference between elementary and secondary education, and without a clear public philosophy of education at any level.

The new students, required to remain in school and knowing that the school was required by law to keep them, could hardly be expected to show the same enthusiasm for education felt by their grandfathers, to whom secondary education was an opportunity opened only to the fortunate few. High schools tried to in a hundred different ways keep students interested: easier courses, more "practical" courses, more varied offerings, individual guidance, dances, parties, and other social activities supervised by the school, and giving credit for everything from social dancing to camping and fishing. At best, the new high school programs were not sufficiently stimulating intellectually to the really bright students, and among the high school graduates coming to college, the brighter students were often the least motivated and had the poorest work habits.

The Debate Itself: Today we are engaged in great national debate over the aims and purposes of education, the debate has included vigorous criticism of existing schools and of the philosophy of education which lies behind them. The great majority of scholars and other intellectuals stands in opposition to the spokesmen for professional education. It is an attack along a broad front of a set of philosophies and practices which

the critics have come to believe dominate our schools and which they are convinced are false and dangerous. The criticism is philosophical in nature; it has to do with the meaning and purposes of education and the role for the school in our culture. It deals by implication at least with the nature of reality, of truth, and of values...The critics ...oppose the too uniform acceptance of pragmatic philosophy as a basis for educational planning; they are alarmed about some of the practices usually identified with progressive education,...they are critical, too, of the way our teachers are educated and selected and of the way school policy is made. They are convinced that a small group of professional educators plays too great a role in determination of school policy, to the exclusion of the scholars from other fields and the general public.

There are serious limitations to this kind of criticism, and because of these, the criticism has in a very real sense failed in its full purpose. It has not given us a clear sense of direction; it has not pointed the way to a new concept of education...The failure lies in the fact that, with few exceptions, the critics have not undertaken the difficult task of formulating a philosophy of education which is acceptable to the American people and appropriate for schools that are required to accept and retain children of all levels of ability and a wide variety of social backgrounds.

We have been wrestling with the problems of increased enrollment and the resulting need for more teachers and more buildings, but our thinking about the goals of education is, if anything, less clear than it was in the mid 30's. The situation is reminiscent of the story told of an airline pilot who addressed his passengers over the intercommunication system to tell them he had lost his way. He explained that the radar was not working, the radio beam could not be picked up, and the compass was broken. "But," he added encouragingly, "you will be glad to know that we are making very good time."

Differing Views of Education: The classic view of education is this: man is a rational being; the proper aim of education is that of improving his ability to reason. Liberal education must be sharply divorced from vocational and other forms of specialized education, which make it impossible for it to discharge its true function. But since intellectual excellence is the chief good from which all other goods follow, liberal education is the best possible preparation for any vocation,

for it results in the fullest development of the mind. Any needed tricks of the trade, or vocational skills, should be learned either in an apprenticeship or a vocational school, which the student may enter after his liberal education has reached a given goal. A proper education must include a kind of examination which is designed to stretch the mind and give the student an ability to think logically and to express his ideas with clarity.

The progressive view is this: The opposite of the classical view may, for American society, be equally unrealistic. Focusing on the "growth of the whole child," the pupil learns to make his own investigations rather than to accept the conclusions of others. To the pragmatist, values rest on no absolutes. A sound value is one which, if accepted, enables the individual to establish a satisfactory working relationship with his world and his fellow man; for values are forms of truth, and "truth is whatever proves itself to be good in the way of belief and good for definite and assignable reasons". Values must constantly be in a process of change, and the values of another era will not be appropriate for men of the present day...The teacher should not "teach values," instead he must show the child how to discover values for himself. Teachers have found this kind of teaching rather complicated; teaching was much simpler when you just told the child it was wrong to steal and let it go at that. Knowledge, scholarship, preservation of the cultural heritage - these are not the ends of education; at best they are means toward ends. The end is the "growth" of the whole child. Education must meet the needs of the individual or must be adapted to his interests; for if he is not interested, he will not respond, and if he does not respond, he will not learn.

As the people began to explore these problems of education they found them enormously complicated and also infinitely more important than that of financing education and of deciding how many years of schooling should be required. Indeed, they found that it has been exceedingly dangerous to specify the amount of education without first deciding what kind and to what ends. Without clear goals, schooling can become mere babysitting or adolescent-sitting, and spending more money for buildings and teachers merely makes for more expensive custodial care.

> A bad education makes for the easier kind of teaching. It is far easier to indoctrinate a child or to teach him to accept cliches than to teach him to examine ideas critically. It is easier to lead him to enjoy soap operas and hillbilly music than to teach him to prefer Bach and Shakespeare; far easier to encourage him to follow the crowd than to teach him to stand alone when the crowd is wrong. Truth is rarely certain; logic is difficult; and ethical and aesthetic values are areas of disagreement. Yet we must be suspicious of the teacher who refuses to help his pupils make decisions about what is most probably true, what is most logical, and what is of greatest worth. We should scorn the educator who, because he finds value judgments difficult and uncertain, refuses to decide whether history, literature, and science are more important in the curriculum than badminton, basket weaving, and fly fishing.

Other surveyors of American educational problems refrain from sweeping recommendations of any kind, calling instead for the modest improvements which local boards of education, with community help, can effect easily. James B. Conant, for example, in his best selling report, The American High School, presents some of his findings in the following selected paragraphs:

> Characteristics of American education: With few exceptions, the public high school is expected to provide education for all the youth living in a town, city, or district. Such a high school has become known as a "comprehensive" high school in contrast to the "specialized" high schools which provide vocational education or which admit on a selective basis and offer only an academic curriculum. I believe it accurate to state that a high school accommodating all the youth of a community is typical of American public education....that it has come into being because of our economic history and our devotion to the ideals of equality of opportunity and equality of status.
>
> Principal Findings (on comprehensive high schools): I found eight schools (out of 22) which, in my judgment, were satisfactorily fulfilling the three main objectives of a comprehensive high school. They were offering adequate instruction in English and social studies as part of general education required of all. These schools were providing significant nonacademic programs which were elected by a substantial number of students. In these same schools, the academic inventory showed that more than half the academically talented boys had studied at least seven years of mathematics and science as well as seven years of English and social studies....The situation with regard to the study of foreign languages in these eight schools was, in most cases, not satisfactory.

In all but a few schools, the majority of bright boys and girls were not working hard enough. Academic studies did not cover a wide enough range.

The Community and the School Board: There are three requisites for the successful operation of a high school: first, a school board composed of intelligent, honest, devoted citizens who understand that their function is policy-making and not administration; second, a first-rate superintendent; third, a good principal. Without a good school board the situation is almost hopeless. Given a good school board and strong leadership by the superintendent and principal, an excellent group of teachers will be recruited, and it is hardly necessary to emphasize that on the quality of the teachers (assuming wise leadership) the quality of the education must ultimately depend.

A Concluding Word: I am convinced American secondary education can be made satisfactory without any radical changes in the basic pattern. This can only be done, however, if the citizens in many localitites display sufficient interest in their schools and are willing to support them. The improvements must come school by school and be made with due regard for the nature of the community. Therefore, I conclude by addressing this final word to citizens who are concerned with public education: avoid generalizations, recognize the necessity of diversity, get the facts about your local situation, elect a good school board, and support the efforts of the board to improve the schools.

C. Discussion Questions

1. Is rural youth seriously disadvantaged relative to his urban counterpart - Because of his frame of reference? or his intellegence? or his income status? or his social acceptance? etc?
2. What is your measure of an adequate secondary education? Ability to get a job? Ability to think? Preparation for College? Classical? Progressive? Vocational?
3. Is there a fundamental disagreement between Woodring and Conant?
4. What do varying philosophies of education have to do with a review of a 4-H program? Of the way we carry out Extension's education job?
5. Is public policy on education part of agricultural adjustment? Does Extension or the Land Grant Institution have any responsibility in this area?
6. Is there public pressure for changes in the framework, organization and objectives of public education?
7. What do you think this quotation means?

> Whether we shall have a steady flow into our leadership ranks of wise, liberally educated men and women with the creativity and sense of values which the future demands, or whether we shall have a paralyzing flow of skilled opportunists, timeservers, and educated fools, depends wholly upon the sense of values which guides our efforts.

GOVERNMENT

The Cooperative Extension Service itself is one of the more remarkable products of the American political process. An analysis of the variety of interests, of political battles, and payoffs, of altruism and petty concerns that spawned the Morrill Act, the Hatch Act and the Smith-Lever Act would tell a fascinating story of political democracy. The concert of support - county, state, and federal - that is the foundation for the Extension Service is one of the amazing adaptations achieved through political decision making. The very role of the County Extension Service, though "helping people to help themselves," is based formally or informally on a system of county government and public control. Clearly the agent must understand the processes of grass roots democracy and small "p" politics, or perish.

Thus the nature of government, of the way in which society makes its decisions is of crucial concern and importance to the Extension Service. Now, when our society is looking anew for fundamental answers, democracy is being put to a new test. Do the issues demand moderation or that we all agree? Are more committees and "better communications" the answer? Is the object of public policy education consensus or agreement? Because of the Soviet threat, must we temper our differences? What does it mean when Secretary of Agriculture Benson says "At what point will 140,000,000 Americans who do not live on farms rise up...and demand not revision but outright elimination of all direct aid to agriculture?"

A. One View of Government. This is what Samuel Lubell, political analyst, newspaperman and winner of the American Political Science Association award for the best book on government and democracy in 1952, say about "Democracy is an Arena" in his book, Revolt of the Moderates:

> The Never Ending Fight: The continuing fight - not sweetness and strength of our democracy springs from the very vigor with which we battle ourselves into unity. That was largely how our founding fathers planned it. The government they devised was designed to be a perpetual friction machine. This was accomplished by a double separation of powers. One of these divisions of the powers of government - by function - has been blurred by the complexities of modern life. Who makes a law today is often less significant than how it is administered. A host of commissions have grown up which merge the executive, legislative and judicial functions in one agency.
>
> The Constitution provided for another separation of powers which has not lost its vitality. It also spread the authority of government among several competing centers of power, leaving

each free to act - until it collided with some other. This distinction between the separation of powers by function and by collision is often overlooked. Yet it is basic to any understanding of the continuing battle over "what is constitutional".

Given this dispersion of power, it is inevitable that some branch of government - sometimes Congress, sometimes the Presidency, sometimes the judiciary - should always seem to be invading the province of other branches. Outcries of "That's unconstitutional" should reassure rather than alarm us. For such outcries mean that our form of government is working as our founding fathers intended it to work.

One can appreciate why where is so much agitation to "make clear what the Constitution means." But such efforts should not be confused as attempts to restore the original intent of the Constitution. In some fields, such as foreign affairs and war, the founding fathers refused to set rigid limits to the authority of either Congress or the Presidency. The minutes of the Constitutional Convention also show that the framers of the Constitution did not believe that any words could be written that would anticipate every contingency that migh arise, or safeguard a nation's liberties. They were relying upon "power to balance power," in Alexander Hamilton's phrase, upon the belief that the best guarantee against usurpation was to have a rival branch of power capable of challenging any such abuse.

Because of the existence of these competing centers of authority, the chance to fight back in defense of one's interests and liberties has not been lost. The talk in recent years of the "decay of the Republic" is belied by the vigor with which those who have been defeated in the battle for the Presidency have taken their fight into Congress and to the courts. Similarly, those who have lost out in the federal arena have carried on the battle through state governments and vice versa. The existence of so many seats of power makes the political battle in the United States a never-ending one. It is difficult, if not impossible, to defeat anything completely and finally, which helps explain why the American political character changes so slowly.

Some nations remain rigid in their political character because the ruling classes maintain so autocratic a hold on the government that the forces of change cannot make themselves felt.

But the stability of the American political character seems to derive from an almost opposite circumstance - the political effects of change are not suppressed, but they must fight their way through a succession of governmental barriers. Veritable revolutions can take place socially and economically with small change in our political institutions.

At all times in our history there has been an "old guard" element, which has been able to fight literally unto the grave for some "cause" which it knew to be lost.

In short, the continuing fight must be put down as the very essence of the American political character. Often the "American Way of Life" is pictured in terms of rigid adherence to some ideology, ignoring that our search for "a more perfect union" has been directed less to s eeking final solutions than at establishing a tolerable balance of conflict among ourselves.

That perhaps is what makes our democracy simultaneously so frustrating and so rewarding. While none of us is able to have our own way in all things, our strivings do enable us to register some improvement in the balance of unity that is struck. The workings of this principle can be seen in all of the more important running conflicts which constitute what might be termed the "American War of Life" - in the ceaseless duels between economic and political power, war and peace, tolerance and intolerance.

The processes of tolerance in this country have never been those of civilized indifference to what others say or do.

Americans have always been trying to make one another over.

There never has been a time in our history when one part of the country was not trying to make the rest of the nation conform to its ideas. This crusading zeal has often been invoked for economic purposes, at other times for religious or racial reasons. Often, the same persons who were zealous in championing one "truth" will protest violently when they become the target for the missionary zeal of some other cause. Recently, for example, I listened to one Southern editor justify his opposition to desegregation on the ground that the government had no right to compel Negroes and whites to attend the same schools. Later in the same conversation this editor argued

that prohibition had never been given a fair trial and ought to be reinstated. This editor seemed unaware of the contradiction in arguing that the government had no business "meddling" with racial relations but that it had a moral responsibility to stop a man from buying liquor.

Similarly, groups who violently opposed prohibition in the 1920's are quite eager to use the power of government to end racial or religious discrimination. Other groups who fight government regulation of child labor as an invasion of parental authority agitate that it is the government's responsibility to provide religious instruction in schools. Men and women who felt that the Sunday blue laws of the 1920's were a Fundamentalist effort to legislate the moral behavior of other religious groups now form themselves into legions to police the "morals" of movies and books.

In sum, Americans have always been intolerant of the ways of other Americans. What has kept this country so sane a place to live in has been the fact that the means were available to fight back against these reformist crusades. Progress in tolerance has come largely through the resistances which intolerance aroused.

This constant battling has made a double contribution to our unity. The reforming crusades have forced changes on different groups of Americans. The resistances to these crusades have compelled the reformers to recognize what could not be changed and had to be lived with.

The Americanization of immigrants affords a good illustration of this dual process. Every immigrant family must survive a bitter hazing before being initiated into the American fraternity. Cruel and usually unjustified discriminations are suffered. Still, these discriminations have contributed to our cultural unity by compelling immigrants to discard their old-world traits and to seek to become as much like other Americans as possible. But these discriminations have also served to strengthen our sense of individualism as well. The very pressures to conform which must be bowed to, reinforce the desire to be treated as individuals, equal before the law.

Of Political and Economic Power: In writing of any country the temptation runs strong to picture it as beset by contradictory tuggings between which the country must choose. Yet in most

such cases it probably is a wiser rule to conclude that the very refusal to make the choice is the true measure of both the country's character and of what it will do. In the matter of tolerance, for example, the American people are often told that the issue lies between the rights of the individual and nationalistic conformity. But if these alternatives seem diametric opposites in theory, they usually are joined inseparably in real life. In the Americanization process acceptance as an individual can be achieved only as one conforms to American ways and mores. The stamp of the American character will be found in neither individualism nor conformity but in the constant struggle to balance the two.

A similar conflict dominates our economic character. "Conservative" spokesmen are warning constantly that any step in the direction of government control of the economy must lead us down the road to totalitarian serfdom. On the opposing extreme, some "liberals" contend that "political democracy requires economic democracy," that unless deomcratic political power takes over the economy, big business will take over the government.

But these dire ideological horoscropes from both "right" and "left" overlook one thing - the American economic character rests upon a stubborn refusal to accept either of these choices, either to merge political and economic power in any complete sense or to keep them completely divorced.

Of War and Peace: There is only one superiority that the Soviets have shown. Although the Soviet Union lay devastated at the end of World War II and could command far less economic or technological resources, it has been able to sustain a heavier arms effort than either we or our allies have been willing to manage.

This is one superiority the Soviets have demonstrated reflects the difference in the structure of totalitarian and democratic power. Under the Soviet system the Kremlin takes what it wants to of Russia's resources for war and defense first, leaving the people to subsist on what is left. In the United States and other Western democracies, economic resources lie dispersed among the people in their holdings of private property. Before those resources can be used even in defense against a foreign foe, they must be collected from the people through appropriations and taxes.

In Russia, in short, the people have only what the government gives them. In the Western democracies, the government has only what the people give it.

Almost that sums up the whole of the cold war. The constant test which we - and our allies - will face as long as the cold war lasts can be reduced to one question - can free men be led to yield to their own government what the defense of their freedoms requires or will they deny their own government the means of survival? The test would be met readily if the dangers were plain and immediate. If we had no choice, all of us would know what to do. Our political leaders would be ready to ask for all that was needed and the people would be ready to give it.

But our trial is more subtle - and more perilous - precisely because we are given the freedom to choose. In the years ahead the dangers abroad are not likely to be so apparent that we will not be left exposed to the temptations of conflicting choices. It will always be possible to "make out a case" for reducing taxes, for demanding that our allies should do more, for reducing our own defense costs by underestimating the enemy's progress, for arguing that we must keep our government weak so we do not "jeopardize our freedoms" at home.

That, in sum, is the test that our new "middle road" conservatism will have to survive. Despite our anti-government tradition we must muster enough faith in one another - enough unity - to yield to our government the power it needs to protect us.

It is a test which permits us no escape from ourselves, from our own character. Nor can any formula be laid down to guide our decisions unless it be this general caution. For a people under siege complacency is the worst possible sentinel. We are less likely to slip into those tragic neglects which could destroy us if we remain alert and aroused than if we think things are taking care of themselves.

The time to worry about this country is not when we are battling among ourselves, for it is then that our democracy functions best. The time to worry is when all "is moderation."

B. Questions for Discussion

1. Does Lubell's concept of government and political democracy confirm or contradict your own views? Is there another view to be considered?
2. Does the sharpness of conflict Lubell describes suggest it would be a mistake for Extension to get in the "middle" by sponsoring public policy education?
3. What issues do you see dividing your county? Urban vs rural? Large vs small?
4. Is the outlook or political attitude of your county changing?
5. Why do fathers and sons sometimes differ in politics?

Lubell says that the continuing conflict between various interests is the hallmark of our democracy. He cites constant battling as strength. But he also says that somehow through the process we must produce an adequate response to the Soviet threat. But what response is demanded? Must the American people simply pay enough taxes for adequate weapons or is it, as Woodring suggests is the problem for American education that more than money is needed.

In a recent book, Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy, Henry Kissinger, Associate Director of the Harvard Center for International Affairs, examines the challenge of the nuclear age. He examines our national psychology which considers peace as the "normal" pattern of relations among states and a feeling that reasonable men can settle all differences by honest compromise; the national sense that the only alternative to war is "total peace" and our difficulty in living with "possible catastrophe"; the feeling that every problem has a final solution in an era when only "partial remedies are possible"; the problem of dealing with notions of limited war; the issue of understanding the strategic implication of communist thought; the intimate relationship of diplomatic, political, military, economic, psychological and other factors as they merge in strategic concept and doctrine.

A. Strategic Concept and Doctrine. Here is a small part of what Kissinger says:

> The Need for Doctrine: Whether the problem concerns questions of military strategy, of coalition policy, or of relations with the Soviet bloc, the nuclear age demands above all the clarification of doctrine. At a time when technology has put in our grasp a command over nature never before imagined, power must be related to the purpose for which is to be used. Research and development will soon overwhelm the military services with a vast number of complex weapons. The usual answer that a service can never possess a too varied capability will no longer do, for it is prohibitively expensive. In the 1930's each service had to select from among perhaps two weapons systems. During World War II this had risen to eight or ten. In the 1950's the number is over 100, and in the 1960's it will be in the thousands. Only a doctrine which defines the purpose of these weapons and the kind of war in which they are to be employed permits a rational choice.

Strategic doctrine transcends the problems of selecting weapons systems. It is the mode of survival of a society relating seemingly disparate experiences into a meaningful pattern. By explaining the significance of events in advance of their occurence it enables society to deal with most problems as a matter of routine and reserves creative thought for unusual or unexpected situations. If a society faces too many unexpected contingencies, the machinery for making decisions will become overloaded. "Nothing is easier to effect," said Machiavelli, "than what the enemy thinks you will never attempt to do." In 1941 we knew that Japan was planning a military move but our strategic doctrine did not foresee the attack on Hawaii.

Our doctrine must be clear about the nature of our strategic interest in the world. It must understand the mode of Soviet behavior and not make the mistake of ascribing to the Soviet leaders a pattern of behavior based on our own standards of rationality. Our doctrine must pay particular attention to determining how the other side calculates its risks. Strategic doctrine, finally, must be able to assess the forces which move contemporary events and find the means for shaping them in the desired direction.

In the absence of a generally understood doctrine, we will of necessity act haphazardly; conflicting proposals will compete with each other without an effective basis for their resolution. Each problem as it arises will seem novel, and energies will be absorbed in analyzing its nature rather than in seeking solutions. Policies will grow out of counter measures taken to thwart the initiatives of other powers; our course will become increasingly defensive.

National Traits Resist Doctrine: Many of our problems of the post war period have been produced by our failure to accept th doctrinal challenge. The fate of the mammoth and the dinosaur serves as a warning that brute strength does not always supply the mechanism in the struggle for survival. Difficulties have been caused by national traits which are deeply engrained in the American experience. Problems have been produced in spite of our good intentions and have been caused not by our worst qualities but by our best.

Foremost among the attitudes which effect the making of our policy is American empiricism and its quest for certainty: Nothing is "true" unless it is "objective", and it is not "objective" unless it is part of experience. This makes for the absence of dogmatism and for the ease of social relations. But it has unfortunate consequences in the conduct of policy. Policy is the art of weighing probabilities; mastery of it lies in grasping the nuances of possibilities. To attempt to conduct it as a science must lead to rigidity. For only the risks are certain. The opportunities are conjectural. One cannot be "sure" about the implications of events until they have happened, and when they have occurred it is too late to do anything about them. Empiricism in foreign policy leads to a penchant for ad hoc solutions. The rejection of dogmatism inclines the policy makers to postpone commiting themselves until all the facts are in; but by the time the facts are in, a crisis has usually developed or an opportunity has passed. Our policy is, therefore geared to dealing with emergencies; it finds difficulty in developing the long range program that might forestall them.

Every Soviet aggressive move finds us debating its implications and creates pressures for deferring the showdown for the "clear" case of aggression Soviet leaders are trying very hard not to present. The paradoxical result is that we, the empiricists, often appear to the world as rigid, unimaginative, and even somewhat cynical, while the dogmatic Bolsheviks exhibit flexibility, daring, and subtlety. This is because our empiricism dooms us to an essentially reactive policy that improvises a counter to every Soviet move while the Soviet emphasis on theory gives them the certainty to act, to maneuver and to run risks. The very fact of Soviet action forces us to assume risks of counter moves and absorbs our energies in essentially defensive measures.

Another factor shaping our attitude towards foreign affairs is that though we have not known severe hardships, our history has been notably free of disaster. Indeed the American domestic experience exhibits an unparallelled success - great daring rewarded and great obstacles overcome. It is no wonder therefore, that to many of our most responsible men, the warnings of the impending peril or of imminent disaster sound like the cries of abstracted "eggheads". They cannot believe that in the nuclear age the penalty for miscalculation may be national catastrophe. These characteristics

make for an absence of the sense of urgency, a tendency to believe that everything can be tried once and that the worst consequence mistakes can have is that we may be forced to redouble our efforts later on. The irrevocable error is not yet part of the American experience.

Related to this is our reluctance to think in terms of power. As a nation we have used power almost shamefacedly, as if it were inherently wicked. We have wanted to be liked for our own sakes and we have wished to succeed because of persuasiveness of our principles rather than through our strength. Our feeling of guilt with respect to power has caused us to transform all wars into crusades.

The Adequacy of Leadership: We thus reach our final problem: the adequacy of our leadership groups for dealing with the challenges we are likely to confront. This is an aspect of a more general problem faced by any society: where to strike a balance between the requirements of organization and the need for inspiration. Organization expresses the importance of continuity; the routine by which it operates represents a recognition that a society must be able to assimilate and utilize mediocrity. Inspiration, on the other hand, is the mechanism of growth; it is the ability to transcend a framework which has come to taken for granted. The stability of a society depends on its skill in organization, which enables it to react mechanically to "ordinary" problems and to utilize its resources to best effect.

The greatness of a society derives from its willingness to chart new ground beyond the confines of routine. Without organization every problem becomes a special case. Without inspiration a society will stagnate; it will lose the ability to adapt to new circumstances or to generate new goals. The experience of a people tends to be confined to the level of its average performance. But leadership is the refusal to confine action to average performance; it is the willingness to define purposes perhaps only vaguely apprehended by the multitude.

Many of the difficulties of our governmental apparatus are common to our entire society and arise primarily from our sudden emergence as the major power in the free world. The character of our leadership groups was formed during a century or more of preoccupation with domestic development. Politics was considered a necessary evil, and the primary

function of the state was the exercise of police powers. Neither training nor incentives impelled our leadership groups to think in political or strategic terms. This emphasis was compounded by our empiricism, with its cult of the expert and its premium on specialization.

Our leadership groups are, therefore, better prepared to deal with technical than with conceptual problems, with economic than with political issues. Each problem is dealt with "on its merits," a procedure which emphasizes the particular at the expense of the general and bogs down planning in a mass of detail. The absence of a conceptual framework makes it difficult for them even to identify our problems or to choose effectively among the plethora of proposals and interpretations produced by our governmental machinery.

This explains many postwar Soviet successes. Whatever the qualities of Soviet leadership, its training is eminently political and conceptual. Reading Lenin or Mao or Stalin, one is struck by the emphasis on the relationship between political, military, psychological, and economic factors, the insistence on finding a conceptual basis for political action and on the need for dominating a situation by flexible tractics and inflexible purpose. And the internal struggles in the Kremlin ensure that only the most iron-nerved reach the top. Against the Politburo, trained to think in general terms and freed of problems of day-to-day administration, we have pitted leaders overwhelmed with departmental duties and trained to think that the cardinal sin is to transgress on another's field of specialization.

A society can operate in this fashion only if disputes are not pushed to their logical conclusions and if disagreements are blunted by avoiding dogmatism. And, in fact, the fear of seeming dogmatic permeates our social scene. Opinions are usually introduced with a disclaimer which indicates that the proponent is aware of their contingency and claims no superior validity for them. This produces a preference for decisions by committee, because the process of conversation permits disagreements to be discovered and adjustments made before positions have hardened. Our decision-making process is, therefore, geared to the pace of conversation; even departmental memoranda on which policy decisions are ultimately based are written with an eye to eventual compromise and not with the expectation that any of them will be accepted in their entirety.

This is not to say that we should imitate Soviet dogmatism. A society can survive only by the genius that made it great. But we should be able to leaven our empiricism with a sense of urgency. And while our history may leave us not well enough prepared to deal with tragedy, it does teach us that great achievement does not result from a quest for safety. Even so, our task will remain psychologically more complex than that of the Kremlin. As the strongest and perhaps the most vital power of the free world we face the challenge of demonstrating that democracy is able to find the moral certainty to act without the support of fanaticism and without a guarantee of success.

B. Questions for Discussion

1. Can you get over the apparent contradiction between Lubell's view that national conflict and an unwillingness to settle dogmatically on one position is a sign of healthy democracy; and Kissinger's feeling that our very traditional methods of thought and operation prevent the development of a "strategic concept"?
2. What do you think the concerns of agriculture look like when viewed from the State Department? From the Pentagon? To what extent can you divorce national agricultural policy or other public policies from the issues of defense, survival and our relations with the rest of the world?
3. To what extent is national stability and economic growth part of a strategic doctrine?
4. Can you see any similarities between the issues posed by Kissinger relating to development of a strategic concept and the problem Extension faces in defining its future?
5. Are people in your county really concerned about the "issues of national survival"?

II. Agricultural Adjustment.

A. Background

The Emergence of the Farm Bloc. Between 1910 and 1925 agricultural acreage harvested in the U. S. increased 15 percent. In large part this was a response to the wartime and post war needs, government exhortation and financial inducements. It has been said "American food saved Europe from hunger and revolution." European recovery meant a decline in the export market for U. S. food. This led to the "paradoxical era" when the Wall Street Journal could state with assurance, "Never before, here or anywhere else, has a government been so completely fused with business," and Coolidge believed both that "the chief business of the American people is business" and "Farmers have never made money. I don't believe we can do much about it." Thus while businessmen "marvelled at having solved the secret of prosperity, the farmers, in gloom and indignation," watched gross agricultural income fall from $17.7 billion in 1919 to $10.5 billion in 1921; the farm price index decline from 215 to 124; land values collapsed and their burden of taxes and debt multiplied.

The cost-price squeeze gave force to the Grange, the Farmers Union, and the new American Farm Bureau Federation. Agricultural senators and representatives began to move together in a Farm Bloc, to "preserve the balance between industrial and agricultural growth." This unity of farm interests produced the McNary-Haugen bill for guaranteed price at home and government-directed dumping abroad. The workability of the bill was less important than its symbol of agriculture's growing political unity and the struggle for a national agricultural policy. In 1924 an alliance between the agricultural South and business defeated the McNary-Haugen bill. In 1927 Southern fears of a cotton surplus produced "a marriage of corn and cotton" to support passage of the bill. It was vetoed by Coolidge - on the same day he increased the tariff on pig iron by 50 percent. Coolidge repeated the veto in 1928.

Around this time John D. Black and M. L. Wilson began to develop the idea of "agricultural adjustment" based on a planned relationship between planting and demand. In 1929 Black produced details of a domestic allotment plan. But whatever the tangible result the importance of this era was that farmers, economists and politicians began to regard agriculture as a national problem. The significance of this was to show through in the depression and despair of the early 30's, when a national agricultural policy began to emerge along with the effort to devise a national solution.

The "New Deal" Background. On may 12, 1933 Congress passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act, establishing a natiοn al agricultrual policy - "an attempt to achieve balance by shifting production out of surplus lines" it was called by Henry Wallace a "contrivance as new in the field of social relations as the first gasoline engine was new in the field of mechanics." The broad design was to correct the imbalance between industry and agriculture by raising farm prices; and to raise farm prices through the curtailment of production, the regulation of marketing and a variety of other devices.

This was the period of the Farm Holiday program, when some Wisconsin farm leaders marched on Madison and Iowa farmers threatened to hang a foreclosing judge, overturned milk trucks and burned bridges. In 1933, cotton was down to 5 cents a pound, with a stock of 8 million bales, to market the crop would drop prices to very nearly nothing. M. L. Wilson convinced Wallace that the existing network of county agents was the only means of taking planted cotton acreage out of production. A "plow up" campaign by county agents resulted in $100 million in benefit payments for the uprooting of one-fourth of the 1933 crop. With cotton then up to 8 or 9 cents, the Commodity Credit Corporation loaned 10 cents on the pound to farmers who agreed to participate in the 1934 reduction program.

The method of price support was soon applied to corn, wheat and other storable commodities. With the prospect of $.35 corn and $2.50 hogs in 1934, the National Corn-Hog Committee supported the slaughter of 6 million little pigs in September of that year.

It was thought that as the economy came into balance and as demand was restored it would be possible to "take off the brakes and step on the gas." In 1934 the dust began to blow with a vengeance on the Great Plains, slashing wheat production. The immediate consequence was imports of wheat in 1935-36; corn up from 10¢ to 70¢, hogs to $7.40, up $5.00 from 1934 and overall a parity shift from 55 to 1932 to 90 in 1936 - a rate of improvement that surpassed that of the general economy.

In its operation the AAA resorted to differing pulls. One was to work with agricultural interests, farmers, processors and so on to increase returns to the agricultural industry; the other was a drive by a reform group that wanted to use the emergency to tackle "revolting evils" as they saw them in the agricultrual economy - the poverty of the sharecropper and the tenant farmers; the condition of farm labor; the profit margins and marketing practices of processors and distributors.

By 1935 acreage limitation provisions of the AAA in its original form began to break down because of, as with wheat, farmers who stayed out of the plans and the increasing productivity of those who stayed in nullified the acreage

reduction logic. A variety of adaptations in farm support machinery began to emerge. In this same era of social-economic action, other acts of importance to America and rural America were passed by Congress -- TVA, CCC, rural electrification, soil conservation, reforestation and grazing control, FSA. Many of these may have represented the logical inconsistency of a political democracy. They were responses to the social-economic and political impetus of the 30's. What should be the response today for the issues posed by "agricultural adjustment"?

The Present Picture. Between 1933 and 1958 around $22 billion were spent on programs to help farmers and rural America. About half was spent for the purpose of "stabilizing, supporting and protecting farm income and prices." Another $22 billion was spent by the government for things such as foreign assistance and though not designed as benefit programs for U. S. farms, did internally influence the market. Present government-held surplus stocks - and the likely continuing decline in aggregate farm income in contrast to a growing population and urban industrial economy - suggests U. S. agricultural policy is not accomplishing its stated economic objective.

The facts are that all cannery vegetables, sugar cane, seed crops and sugar beets are now produced on contract basis in the United States; the broiler industry is 90 percent "integrated"; one-third of the major meat packers and 40 percent of the feed companies have arrangements with cattle producers or feeders; one-fourth of the American mutton is produced through contract arrangement; two-thirds of the larger packing firms have plans for extending the now 10 percent of pork integration; Tennessee farmers are moving out of subsistence cotton and peanut farming to contract hog production; and some economists predict that in a very few years 90 percent of all meat and groceries will be sold by food chains - powerful enough to create an oligopolistic dictation of price. These facts raise further questions for a national agricultural policy.

B. The Issue Today

The Broad Adjustment Problems. You, as county Extension staff members, have in recent years been at the center of some remarkable changes in the lives and welfare of the people you serve.

How much change and how fast varies from state to state and county to county. But every American feels to some degree these rapid shifts in a way of life:

--America's total farm output climbed 36 percent between 1940 and 1957, while the country's farm population dropped by 10 million, or one-third in the 17-year period. Man hours of labor needed to do all the farm work also declined one-third, while the use of major field machines increased more than four times over the 1940 level.
--There are about one-fourth fewer farms in the U. S. today than there were in 1940, yet the total acreage under cultivation has changed hardly at all.
--In 1950 there were about 2 million (or 32 percent) fewer 10 to 19 year olds on American farms than there had been 10 years earlier--about the same number of non-farm 10 to 19 year olds in both census years.
--In this era of "unprecedented prosperity," farm prices in the country hover around 80 percent of parity, based on 1910-14 relationships between prices received and paid by farmers.

These are some of the adjustments. You have felt their impact in your county. And you are aware that the dimensions of agricultural adjustment reach beyond your county and include your state, the nation, and even the world, where surplus farm production and abject hunger exist almost side by side.

Agricultural adjustment influences people in your county -- the farmer, his children, his income and security, and the merchants, suppliers, teachers, ministers and others who serve him and depend on him. But agricultural adjustment has its roots in a national pattern of farm mechanization and consolidation, industrial progress, the revolution in marketing and distribution, national and state farm legislation, the changing eating habits of the American people, the inability of underfed Asians, Latin Americans and others to buy the bounty of the American farm.

Our mutual objective is to meet agricultural adjustment head on and successfully in every county. But efforts will make sense only if the total problem in all its dimensions is tackled.

Dimensions of the Problem: This much is already clear: Agricultural adjustment is not a problem limited to any one state; nor is it a problem which can be solved solely by making changes in agricultural technology or marketing; it is a problem which stems from agriculture's relationship to the rest of the economy.

Here, in oversimplified terms, is a way of looking at it:

> American farming -- along with American industry -- has improved its efficiency and its productivity in this age of mechanization and scientific agriculture. Both our farms and our factories are producing more goods per man-hour of work.
>
> American industry has found expanded market -- at home and overseas -- to absorb its expanded output.
>
> And many service industries -- wholesaling, freezing, packaging, advertising, etc. -- have expanded and profited at the same time.
>
> But the American farm produces more food and fiber than the American people want or need -- and more than the people of an underfed world can afford to buy.
>
> Excessive production costs on some farms are caused by the use of out-moded technology and too much labor and capital in relation to land. The present level of farm output on these farms is not being produced at minimum cost.
>
> Resources - including human energy - used on some farms are not earning a return comparable to the best organized farms nor to resource earnings outside of agriculture.

These are the broad dimensions of agricultural adjustment. These are the over-all trends in the total economy which are changing the way of life of farm and non-farm families in your county - the people who look to you and your county team for leadership.

What do these trends spell for agriculture's future? Here are a few projections:

> With the consolidation of commercial farms into more adequate economic units, now going on, some 70 to 80 thousand commercial units disappear each year. This compares to a retirement rate of present commercial farmers of perhaps 100 thousand or so a year. Thus there is limited entry opportunity if the adjustment continues at a rapid rate.
>
> More than usual, then, farm reared boys must look elsewhere for job opportunities.

Some will turn to business, merchandising, etc.; some will enter the professions - medicine, law, teaching, etc.; some will continue to farm part time and enter business or industry part time; some may be instrumental in bringing new business and new industry not otherwise anticipated to your state; some may train themselves, for managerial and other job opportunities outside the state.

Dimensions of Agricultural Adjustment in your County. In the previous section we took a streamlined look at two of the dimensions of agricultural adjustment:

Agriculture's relationship to the rest of the world economy.

The outlook and opportunity for American agriculture in the near future.

The third dimension is, "What's happening now, in terms of agricultural adjustment, in your county?" Your primary concern is the men and women - old and young, farm and non-farm - in your county. How is agricultural adjustment affecting them?

Here, in capsule form, are some of the nationwide trends. You may wish to use this as check list to help you sort out trends in your county.

1. FARM POPULATION--Nationally the farm population dropped from 30.5 million in 1940 to 25.1 million in 1950 and 20.4 million in 1957. What is happening to the farm population in your state and county? _____

_____

2. NONFARM POPULATION--Throughout the nation, the non-farm population is steadily increasing -- 101.6 million in 1940, 126.6 million in 1950 and 150.8 million in 1957. Is the non-farm population in your county also growing?

_____

3. FARM SIZE--The trend nationally is for the consolidation of small farms. Between 1940 and 1954 in the U. S. there was a 33 percent drop in the number of farms 10 to 100 acres, while those over 180 acres increased in number by 2 percent. Those 260 acres and over increased in numbers by 11 percent. (However, large-scale farms in the United States -- those using

a relatively large labor force -- declined 31 percent.) As farms get larger, their number decreases. For the whole country there were 22% fewer farms in 1954 than there were in 1940. How do these figures compare with consolidation trends in your county? _____

_____

4. FARM JOB OPPORTUNITIES--On a national basis there were only 70 percent as many farm jobs in 1957 as there were in 1940, a natural result of increased farm efficiency and increased output per man-hour. How to farm job opportunities in your county compare with the state trends? _____

_____

5. NONFARM JOB OPPORTUNITIES--Throughout the U. S., jobs are opening up in industry, the professions and other non-farm fields. Between 1950 and 1958 jobs for professional, technical and kindred workers expanded by 43 percent and for clerical workers by 27 percent, while those for common laborers (non-farm) declined 8 percent and farm jobs dropped by 17 percent. What about yourcounty? Are industry and trade opening up new non-farm job opportunities for your people?

_____

6. EDUCATION--In the U.S. only 28 percent of the farm men and 38 percent of the farm women had gone beyond the eighth grade in 1950. By 1957, however, 35 percent of the farm men and 46 percent of the farm women had gone on to high school or college. Only 16 percent of U. S. farm men were high school graduates in 1950; in 1957 the figure was 21 percent. In your county are more farm teenagers taking advantage of high school and college educations than in the past? _____

_____

The answers to these and other questions which you may raise will help you determine where your county stands in the total agricultural process.

C. Questions for Discussion.

1. The notion of agricultural adjustment is not new. How does the concept of adjustment that went into the legislation of the 1930's differ from what is valid for today?
2. People seem to be "adjusting" out of agriculture in a hurry. What difference does it make whether or not Extension does anything?
3. Can you see separate tasks posed by adjustment for Extension, for research, and for resident teaching? How do the tasks differ? How do they relate?
4. How do the Great Debates bear on adjustment questions and a national agricultural policy?
5. Is adjustment important to the national welfare?
    a. in terms of domestic needs
    b. in terms of foreign policy and the needs of diplomacy.

II. Extension and the Future.

A. Scope Report

The Scope Report emphasizes that "Extension's function...is education for action." To fulfill this responsibility, whether in a matter of change in farming practice, 4-H projects or public policy, Extension faces "the necessity to shift programs and methods." Otherwise Extension will not keep pace with swift and accelerating changes and will be unable to provide the leadership which "helps people to help themselves." "All significant trends reemphasize the fact that....programs and procedures appropriate and adequate yesterday are likely to be inappropriate today and obsolete tomarrow." "Extension's responsibilities are to farm families first, but not to them alone." This is so for two reasons. Non-farm and rural families are interested in what Extension offers. Second, "the increasingly complex, interdependence of agriculture and other segments of our economy" make many non-farm and urban factors an integral part of the solution to rural problems, and vice versa.

But, the Scope Report continues, "A major operational problem for Extension is how to allocate its time and resources so that the highest priority needs of those other than farm people are given appropriate attention." Because of the diversity of economic and population patterns throughout the nation, this allocation of Extension resources necessarily "must be determined within each state, and to a large degree, within each county." In performing its educational task for farm and other people, Extension must not exhaust itself on the insignificant but, rather, insure that "problems of major importance...are given priority." The Scope Report concludes, "Extension needs...to define and to agree on....the major elements comprising a hard core of its educational responsibilities that have fairly universal application, and use this as a guide to educational efforts."

Implications. The implication of the Scope Report is clear. It is the difference between farming a quarter-section and 4 sections. You don't just do all things bigger, you do many of them differently. When a man could make a good living on a quarter-section it was well for Extension to have a quarter-section outlook and way of doing things. Thus, questions for Extension cover both "programs and procedures," what to do and how to do it in a 4-, 8- and 24- section type world.

America is facing a fundamental challenge posed by the many streams of social, technological and economic change from within and an urgent issue of survival posed from without. No farm family is free of these matters. Our concerns with survival and the quality of life make us wonder if it is right for rural and small town youth to get a poorer education than big city students;

or what it means for society that 38 percent of all Americans work for organizations that have more than 500 employees; what it means to democracy that nearly seven out of ten Americans live in the nation's 168 metropolitan areas, and of these 40 million are "strictly suburban"; or it is that farm migrants don't do too well competing in the city and that unskilled unemployed Detroit auto workers can't get jobs, while for society as a whole overeating is a greater threat to health than malnutrition; why is half of the farm land in Illinois owned by widows; and how important is it that seven men have been picked to go into space - and come back?

Extension Leadership. If you wonder what all this and more means in an era of accelerating change and what tasks this poses for Extension then read on. But be warned - by doing so you are assuming that in things that really matter for America the Cooperative Extension Service has a leadership job!

Sometimes we think leaders are people who run committees or are the key men whose support we depend upon to "make things go." Others call leaders those persons with vision and the courage to implement this vision. One writer says there are two clear identification marks of a leader: (1) he has an innate propensity for change and innovation; (2) he manages to change men's beliefs, attitudes and behaviors with benefit to many people.

What is Extension's own leadership task? Change of practice plus what? With all complex decisions facing the people we serve and the many forces defining their future - what should be the county agent's job? And what does your definition imply for the State Extension Service and the Land Grant Institution? Where in this world of change and challenge does the County Extension Service fit? What job are we doing now? What is the future task? By what methods shall we perform these tasks? What perspective do we need to answer any of these questions?

We know some pretty radical changes have occurred to the economic, social, and even the philosophical image of farm life which was valid when the Smith-Lever Act was passed. But now we wonder if society and its needs have changed more than Extension's responses to it. Though Extension has grown, is it still as important to America and American agriculture as it was in, say 1920 or 1933?

The County. It is well to keep all the broader questions and issues in mind. But at some point you always have to come back to the county and to the person knocking on your door for help.

B. Questions for Discussion.

1. There are many ways of viewing what makes up a county. The Bureau of Census would divide it according to farm, rural non-farm and urban, age and sex, education, and economic activity. Another way of looking at it would be as a matter of economic conerns, such as business, industry or farms; and family interest

QUESTION: WHAT PEOPLE OF THE COUNTY AND WHAT AREAS OF THEIR CONCERN CONSTITUTE YOUR CONSTITUENCY?

2. Answers to the first question will only give you an answer for today, one point in time. Few things in the world can stand still, for the very act of moving in a swiftly changing world is to fall behind.

QUESTION: WHAT MAJOR CHANGES ARE TAKING PLACE IN YOUR COUNTY -- TO ITS POPULATION AND ITS ECONOMY? IS YOUR COUNTY GROWING OR DECLINING? IS THE COUNTY EXTENSION SERVICE IN THE MAINSTREAM OR THE BACK-WASH OF CHANGE? PROVIDING LEADERSHIP OR FOLLOWING ALONG?

3. People now have many more sources of information and education than when Extension first came into existence. Also people are, on the whole, better educated; their lives and the solution to problems are more complicated. Their range of interests is broader. Thus they can turn to farm journals and homemaking magazines, salesmen-agents, the public schools and many other sources for information and education. They wonder about the economic state of the nation and about leisure. They may even wonder whether to vacation in Florida or Europe.

QUESTION: IN VARIOUS AREAS OF CITIZEN CONCERN, WHAT IS THE RELATIVE STATUS OF THE COUNTY EXTENSION SERVICE AS A SOURCE OF INFORMATION, EDUCATION, AND GUIDANCE? IN WHAT AREAS AND FOR WHOM ARE YOU THE PRIMARY SOURCE? THE SECONDARY SOURCE? IS THERE EDUCATIONAL WORK OF BENEFIT TO FAMILY AND SOCIETY THAT NEEDS DOING WHICH ISN'T BEING ADQUATELY DONE NOW BY EXTENSION OR ANYONE ELSE? CAN THIS WORK BE DONE WITHIN A SINGLE COUNTY?

4. Extension speaks frequently of the "grass roots" and its educational and aministrative logic has been called the "trickle up" theory. Does grass roots determination mean Extension must wait to be told what to do - all of the time? Some of the time? Never? If the grass roots know all then little broad responsibility or direction need be lodged in the State Extension Service. They need only provide the specialists the grass roots call for to deal with specific problems.

QUESTION: HAS THE NATURE OF PROBLEMS FACED BY COUNTY PEOPLE CHANGED SUFFICIENTLY - IN KIND OR COMPLEXITY - TO REVISE OUR NOTIONS OF SIMPLE GRASS ROOTS DEMOCRACY? CAN "THE PEOPLE" OR A COMMITTEE DEFINE WHAT TO DO OR JUST HINT AT WHAT'S BOTHERING THEM? WHAT IS THE LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITY OF EXTENSION? AT THE COUNTY LEVEL? ON WHAT PROBLEMS IS THE COUNTY THE BEST "EDUCATIONAL UNIT"? ARE OTHER THAN COUNTY APPROACHES EVEN CALLED FOR?

5. After a certain point it is impossible for an overworked County Extension Service staff to add more programs. We know the problem is not as simple as cutting off the old to add the new. Some people have suggested totally new forms of Extension organization. Here are a range of old and new concepts of the County Extension Service's "educational" relation and responsibility to the community. Which do you think is the form of the present? Of the future? It may be that none of the alternatives below is adequate or accurate. What picture of the future County Extension Service would you paint?

a. TRADITIONAL: As a source of technological and other tested and proven information advanced through the three lines of traditional distinct concern; with direct assistance from appropriate state specialists available to call; and with accomplishment measured by "change of practice" in agriculture and home economics, plus project work by youth. To expand program add more county staff and state specialists. Program has a narrow agricultural orientation.

b. MODIFIED TRADITIONAL: As in the traditional (above) but with some degree of county staff integration particularly in areas of new programs such as home and farm development, public policy, or school re-organization. To expand and integrate, but also add more county staff and state specialists. Program has a primary agricultural orientation plus something more.

c. RADICAL: The County Extension Service becomes an educational administrative center able to deliver information, resources and program but not necessarily through the hand or mouth of the county agent. Many basic services to commercial agriculture may be supplied directly from the college. Courses in anything from soil physics to child psychology or how to play the stock market (with college credit and fees where appropriate) may be organized and administered through the County Extension Service. The State Extension Service would be tooled to provide the special materials and other instruments of organization essential for broad scale county work in areas such as public policy and other areas of fundamental concern. This could mean less direct action and education by the specialist and more materials that do the job. In certain areas the state would supersede the county staff to multiply its ability and energy within traditional or new areas of concern. Extension performs its traditional obligation to agriculture, but in new ways - and agriculture is <u>one</u> sector of a much broader responsibility.

III. Adjustment Appendix

A. Some Individual Views of Agricultural Adjustment

These individual views have been presented by the authors at Farm Foundation conferences, Adjustment Center meetings and elsewhere.

1. Adjusting the Supply Side - J. Carroll Bottum

We must consider programs to raise farm income from a realistic standpoint. In the long run, all proposals to improve per capita farm income by raising farm prices above competitive levels in our dynamic society tend to be self-defeating.

Market quotas, limitation of crop acreages, and limitation of capital, labor and management are unlikely to be acceptable to farmers or workable economically. Land retirement programs show the most promise in taking the necessary 50 million acres out of production.

If a market cannot be found for expanding supplies of farm products and the free economic forces are allowed to work, some of our high-cost crop producing areas will shift to other uses. The movement of human resources out of agriculture alone is not enough to bring supply and demand into balance. An intelligent and properly administered land retirement program can ease this shift. Eventually, it should be directed towards shifting the marginal plow land to other uses. In the early stages, more emphasis may have to be given to more uniform shifts throughout the country to obtain immediate but temporary adjustments, but eventually it should be directed heavily toward the lower returning plow land. In developing farm programs in our dynamic economy, the adjustments that the normal economic forces are bringing about should be recognized and farm programs should be developed to facilitate these adjustments rather than to reverse them or maintain the status quo if we accept economic progress and growth as one of our goals.

2. Adjusting the Demand Side - Dr. Elmer W. Learn

Proposals to solve the surplus problem from the demand side have been with us for at least as long as we have had the problem. For convenience, we can separate these proposals into two distinct classifications; 1., those that relate to domestic

utilization of farm products and 2., those that are designed to affect utilization of U. S. products outside the United States.

Such proposals have come to be known under the general heading of demand expansion. They have taken many forms but most proposals for domestic policies can be classified under one or more of the following approaches: 1. Income; 2. Price; 3. Nutrition; 4. Promotion; and 5. New Uses.

Eight percent represents a conservative estimate of the annual food consumption increase needed to completely remove surpluses.

The conclusion one draws concerning the possibilities of solution to the surplus problem via the demand approaches - either domestic or foreign - is one of pessimism. Domestic demand expansion policies may serve as complements to other programs, but they will not remove more than one-fourth to one-third of the current surplus production.

3. Conflicts in Farm Production Policies - Dr. D. R. Kaldor

Public resources are being used to improve production practices, to reclaim agricultural land and to encourage greater imputs of capital in the farm industry. These actions are output-increasing in their effect. On the other hand, under the Soil Bank program, public resources are being used to reduce the input of land in an effort to cut farm production.

Basically, the imbalance in farm output reflects an imbalance in resources in the farm industry. Over the longer pull, this imbalance will need to be corrected if income earning opportunities in farming are to be raised to a level comparable with non-farm employments, and if the contributions to economic growth of justifiable public investments in better farm technology and resource development are to be fully realized. Correcting the imbalance in resources will involve a large additional transfer of labor and probably some transfer of land and capital to nonfarm employments.

In a period of a few years, little headway can be made in correcting the imbalance in resources. Short-run programs to ease the effects of this imbalance are probably justifiable and acceptable to most Americans. However, unless these

programs are coupled with a set of long-range programs geared to facilitate basic resource adjustments, we are likely to be no closer to a solution to the farm problem in 1965 than we are today.

4. Logical Combinations of Approaches - Dr. G. E. Brandow

The wide variety of circumstances confronting producers of individual commodities creates an economic justification for combining different types of programs in developing an effective farm policy. In addition, the political necessity of compromising rival proposals and the reluctance to drop old ideas will make a combination of programs inevitable in the future.

Several of the main alternative approaches could be the sole basis for agricultural policy. But even if they were effective in achieving their main purposes, shortcomings in other respects would create demands for supplementary programs. Some kind of program on the supply side of the market -- a version of the conservation reserve, for example -- might succeed in bringing about a better overall balance between production and markets. A wheat problem would still remain, however, instability of hog production and prices would persist, and problems peculiar to individual fruits and vegetables would be little affected. Supplementary programs to deal with such situations might include control of marketings of particular commodities, temporary use of direct payments, storage of feed grains, and marketing agreements and orders.

Though there are good reasons for combining different programs, a great danger is that attention will be focused exclusively upon particular commodities and that the effects of one upon the other will be ignored. The outstanding example of this to date has been the commodity-by-commodity approach to production control. Resources have merely been chased from the controlled crops to others, mainly feed grains. We should have a clear policy of employing production control where only such shifts of resources can be largely prevented. This can be accomplished with cash crops like wheat and cotton -- the worst offenders so far -- by requiring that acreage formerly devoted to the controlled crops not be used for any other farm purposes. Attempting to withdraw resources as production is reduced in the feed-livestock sector is much more difficult (it is like extracting an impacted wisdom tooth), but it might be done.

B. Agricultural and Adjustment Statistics

Statistics which set out the dimensions of the agricultural and adjustment problems are available from many sources. The annual Economic Almanac, the U. S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Statistics and recent issues of Outlook Charts contain many such statistics.

Bibliography

The following are a small sampling of literature related to the concepts and problems raised in this publication. Roman numerals at the left refer to the section to which each relates most closely.

II, III Agricultural Adjustment Problems in a Growing Economy by Earl Heady and others. North Central Farm Management Research Committee. Iowa State College Press. 1958. 315 pp. $3.95.:

I America's Next Twenty Years by Peter F. Drucker. Harper, New York. 1957. $2.75. Considers our probable future in terms of education, labor, population changes, etc.

I The American High School Today by James B. Conant. McGraw-Hill, New York. 1959. 140 pp. $1.00. Report of a Carnegie Foundation survey of American high schools with recommendations for intensifying training at that level.

II A Balanced Agriculture by 1965 by John D. Black and James F. Bennen. National Planning Association, Washington, D. C.

I The Dynamics of Soviet Society by W. W. Rostow and others. New American Library. 50¢

I Fourth of a Nation by Paul Woodring. McGraw-Hill, New York. 1957. 255 pp. $4.50. Survey of the vast educational opportunities and the attendant problems in the U. S.

I, III The Future of American Politics by Samuel Lubell, Anchor Books, 95¢

I, II, III The Markets of the Sixties. Series of articles beginning in March, 1959 Fortune magazine. Articles covering various aspects of probable social and economic trends for the next 10 years in the U. S.

I, III The Pursuit of Excellence. Special Studies, Project Report V, Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Doubleday, New York. 1958. 48 pp. 75¢. Places U. S. education needs in the perspective of an expanding America faced by new dangers and opportunities as a world power.

II, III Toward a New Farm Program. Conference on Economic Progress. Washington, D. C. 1958. 62 pp. 50¢.

II, III Toward a Realistic Farm Program. Committee for Economic Development. New York, 1957. 54 pp.

I, II, III Science and Education for National Defense. Hearings of the U. S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. 1958. A vast array of information on suggestions for improving education in the U. S.; deals with topics much broader than "defense needs."

I Five Ideas that Changed the World by Barbara Ward. Norton. 1959. 188 pp. $3.75. Explores the impact of nationalism, industrialization, colonialism, communism and internationalism with special reference to underdeveloped nations.

I, II, III Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy by Henry A. Kissinger. Harper and Brothers, New York. 1957. 463 pp. $5.00. Examines political and technical questions of the nuclear age, with a discussion of limited nuclear warfare.

I The Population Explosion by Karl Sax. Headline Series, No. 120. Foreign Policy Association, 345 E. 46th St., New York. November-December 1956. 61 pp. 35¢. Discusses ways and means of dealing with the rapid growth of the world's population as compared with available resources of food, raw materials and manufactured goods.